

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Request for Continued Examination:

- 5 The applicant respectfully requests continued examination of the above-indicated application as per 37 CFR 1.114.

**Rejection of claims 1, 5, 13 and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (APA), figures 1-2, in view of
10 Sato, US 2006/0097380.**

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to specify that the driver chip (such as the gate driver chip and the source driver chip) is thinned to reduce the stress created between the chip and the glass substrate.

15

Despite Sato teaches a plurality of driver chips that are 0.3 mm or less, Sato fails to suggest that these chips are thinned to reduce the stress created between the chip and the glass substrate. Instead, Sato in paragraph [0067] of the cited reference recites the "heat sink 53 becomes protuberant above the driver IC chip 9, and to avoid
20 this, the driver IC chip 9 is thinly polished or buffed", which clearly suggests that the IC chip 9 disclosed in Sato's invention is specifically thinned to provide a plane surface.

Sato therefore fails to teach, suggest, or in any way provide proper motivation to
25 fabricate a semiconductor module that those skilled in the art would find it reasonable to combine with the liquid crystal module disclosed by the admitted prior art of the present invention, in which the liquid crystal module is specifically fabricated for relieving stress between IC chip and glass substrate thereby reducing curtain mura between these two units.

30

Moreover, an anisotropic conductive film or a non-conductive film is utilized in the present invention for bonding the driver chip and the glass substrate. Despite the prior art of the present invention suggested the utilization of anisotropic conductive film, this feature is clearly absent in Sato's invention. Instead, Sato in Fig. 9 of the cited reference teaches that an underfill layer 51 is formed to bond the IC chip 9 and the circuit board 3.

Applicants submit that if the driver chip taught by Sato is construed as the driver chip of the present invention, the adhesive (such as the underfill layer 51) used for bonding the driver chip must also be comparable to the adhesive (such as anisotropic conductive film) of the present invention. As the target substrate (such as the circuit board 3) and the adhesive (such as the underfill layer 51) disclosed in Sato are significantly different from the substrate (glass substrate) and adhesive (anisotropic conductive film) of the present invention, it is obvious that the liquid crystal display module taught by Sato cannot be combined with the admitted prior art of the present invention.

In addition, applicants submit that the semiconductor module proposed by Sato is classified under **Class 257 and Subclass 706** according to the USPC Schedule. Specifically, Class 257 relates to active solid-state devices such as transistors and solid-state diodes and Subclass 706 under this class pertains specifically to a device with heat sink. The liquid crystal display module of the present invention on the other hand is classified under **Class 349 and Subclass 149** of the USPC Schedule. Specifically, Class 349 relates to liquid crystal cells, elements and systems and Subclass 149 pertains to elements having connection detail to external circuit.

As the semiconductor module taught by Sato belongs to a completely different field from the liquid crystal display module of the present invention, applicants submit that there is clearly **lack of motivation** to combine Sato's invention with the admitted prior art of the present invention in the manner suggested as such combination would

not have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, and it is clear that the cited reference does not contain any suggestion, whether explicit or implicit, that they can and should be combined, and in any specific manner to obtain the claimed invention.

5 In light of the above, applicants submit that the liquid crystal display module of the present invention is patentable over the combined teachings of Sato and the admitted prior art of the present invention. Reconsideration of amended claims 1 and 13 is respectfully requested. As claims 5 and 16-21 are dependent upon claims 1 and 13, applicants submit that if claims 1 and 13 are found allowable, claims 5 and 16-21
10 should additionally be found allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.
15

Sincerely yours,

_____/Winston Hsu/_____
20 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

25 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)